Journal
OF THE
University of Bombay



[ARTS NUMBER 36]

Vol. XXX (New Series) SEPTEMBER 1961 Part 2

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

BOOK REVIEW

vācaka. The *lopa* of one of the Upamānas which constitute a multiple Upamāna is common. Dharmaluptā occurs frequently as the common property is left to the understanding of the discerning reader. Vākyopamās as well as Upamās based on Vaidharmya are, by no mean, uncommon. Free expression of Śaṅkarācārya has given rise to many irregularities. Thus at times the Upameya-vākya as well as the Upamāna-vākya are put in a succinct form. On some occasions, however, both namely, the Upameya-vākya as well as Upamāna-vākya are very loosely constructed and have to be recast for the purposes of understanding the simile. This is only natural as the Ācārya was not primarily interested in ornamentation.

ŚAṄKARA-VIJAYA OF ANANTĀNANDAGIRI

DR. W. R. ANTARKAR

AFTER discussing the works of Citsukha and Ānandagiri, I wish to deal with the third of the ten works referred to in my previous article.[1] I intend to discuss only two such works as they have given rise to some controversy. The present work is one of the two and is taken up first because that, in my humble opinion, is comparatively the older one.

This work was published in the Bibliotheca Indica Series in 1881 A.D. by Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara. It is also available in ms.-form at many places.[2] All these copies generally contain 74 chapters though the Kāśī and Śaṅkeśvara mss. have only 78 chapters. The Śaṅkeśvara mutt ms. gives the name of the work as mata-nibarhaṇa (refutation of theories) whereas the colophons to the first three ch pt rs of the work in the printed edition give its name as Ācārya-Vijaya.[3]

There are two controversial issues with regard to this work, viz. (1) Identity of the author and (2) authenticity of the work itself. I shall deal with them separately.

Identity of the author

The colophons at the end of the first 32 chapters of the printed edition of this work give the author's name as Anantānandagiri whereas the remaining 42 chapters give it as Ānandagiri. This creates the impression that one and the same person bears these two names. This impression seems to be current among many scholars even today, who believe t at this work is written by Ānandagiri, the famous commentator of Śrī Śaṅkarācārya's Bhāṣyas. In my humble opinion, however, Anantānandagiri and Ānandagiri are two distinct individuals, out of whom the first and not the second is the author of the work in question. My reasons are as follows :

(1) The Ānandāśrama Mss. Library, Poona, contains two mss. of this work. I have also a copy of the same procured from the Saṅkeś-

1. Vide JUB Vol. XXIX—Part 2—Sept. 60.
2. (*i*) Ānandāśrama Mss. Library, Poona, (*ii*) Oriental Research Institute, Mysore, (*iii*) Shrīrāma Tāraka Mutt, Kāśī, (*iv*) Sarasvatī Mahāl, Tanjore etc.
3. The stanzas quoted by Suṣamā as from Ācārya-Vijaya are found in this Ś. V. The work Ācārya-Vijaya, therefore, is not an anonymous work as maintained by Mr. R. K. Aiyar in his booklet, 'Kumbakonam Mutt claims' at p. 23.

vara mutt. All these three mss. give in all the colophons the name of the author as Anantānandagiri.

(2) At the very commencement of the work itself, the author refers to himself as Anantānandagiri.[4] At the beginning of Ch. IV, however, of the same, he refers to Ānandagiri independently and that also by the side of Śuddhānanda.[5]

(3) Ānandagiri, the commentator of Srī Śaṅkara's Bhāṣyas, invariably refers to himself as the disciple of Śuddhānanda Yati whereas we do not get a single such reference in any of the colophons either in the printed copy or in the mss. Our author has referred to Śaṅkara as his Paramaguru and called himself his अप्रतिहतशिष्य[6] suggesting his contemporaneity with his Guru. Curiously enough, he refers to himself in the third person but in the same capacity of a direct disciple, in a later chapter.[7]

(4) I have already referred in my previous article, to 800 and odd stanzas quoted by Dhanapatisūrin in his commentary Ḍiṇḍima on ch. XV of Mādhava's S. Ś. Jaya and also shown that not even one of these can be traced to the Ś. V. of Anatā., at present under consideration and that they must have belonged to an older work which can be identified as Pr. Ś.V. of Ānandagiri, the disciple of Śuddhānanda.[8] These stanzas describe in details the various stages of Śaṅkara's triumphant tour. The Ś.V. of Anantā. in question is mostly occupied with a similar description. On a comparison of the two descriptions it was found that they agreed with each other almost completely with regard to (1) the order of the various stages of the tour, (2) the names of the opponents and also of the places where they were encountered, (8) the descriptions of the two, (4) arguments and citations on either side, (5) the period of Śaṅkara's stay at every place etc. In spite of this agreement, however, it is clear that the two descriptions are from two different pens, for,

(a) The order of stages in Anantā.'s work is different at two or three places from the one as found in the quoted stanzas.

4. Read the opening words—अनन्तानन्दगिरिरहम् ....।

5. Read : ....भानुमरीचिकृष्णदर्शनबुद्धिवृद्धिविरिञ्चिपादशुद्धानन्दानन्द-गिरिप्रमुखैः शिष्यवरैः सेव्यमानः............श्रीशङ्करभगवत्पादाचार्यः ।

6. Read : अनन्तानन्दगिरिरहमप्रतिहतशिष्यः मम परमगुरोरवतारकथां .....करोमि । and also his salutation, just prior to this sentence—

नमामि शङ्कराचार्यगुरुपादसरोरुहम् । यस्य प्रसादान्मूढोऽपि सर्वज्ञोऽहं सदास्म्यलम् ॥

7. Read—कदाचिच्छिष्याः अनन्तानन्दगिरिप्रमुखाः परमगुरुं नत्वेदमूचुः । ch. 66

8. Vide JUB—Vol.-XXIX, Part 2, Sept. 60.

(b) Anantā.'s work contains more prose and less poetry and much more annotative matter than is to be found in the quoted stanzas.

(c) The bulk of the stanzas quoted cannot at all be traced to Anantā.'s work.

All these facts, I believe, are sufficient to show that Anantānandagiri, the author of our present work is distinct from the celebrated Ānandagiri though the question who followed whom remains undecided. I am supported in my belief by Prof. B. Upādhyāya who also holds the same view in tihs matter.[9] The misconception about the identity of the two has led the late Mr. M. R. Bodas to remark that the stanza "कल्पद्रुम शरेक्षणाब्धनयनैः" etc. quoted as from Ānandagiri's work is not found in the printed work (i.e. Ś.V. of Anantā.)[10] The stanza properly belongs to Pr. Ś.V. of Ānandagiri. To decide the question of priority and the true meaning of the expression अप्रतिहतशिष्य we must try to settle the date of Anantā. The late Mr. Telang has advanced mainly two arguments for the purpose.[11] They are :

(1) Anantā. cites in ch. XIX of his work the stanza "अजामेकां लोहितशुक्लकृष्णाम्" etc. as a śruti text. According to Mr. Telang, this stanza is not a śruti text but is one of the introductory stanzas in Vācaspati's Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī. Vācaspati is generally assigned to the 9th cent. A.D. Ś.V. of Anantā., therefore, has to be placed later.

This, however, does not seem to be convincing for the stanza in question is not only found in Śvetasvatara Up. (4:5) but has also been quoted as a śruti text by Śrī Śaṅkarācārya in his commentary on the Br. Sutras. (Vide comm. on Br. Su. 1:4:8).

(2) Ś.V. quotes in ch. XI and XL three stanzas as from Adhikaraṇaratnamālā or Vyāsādhikaraṇamala,[12] traditionally ascribed to Mādhavācārya a/s Vidyāraṇya or Bhāratītīrtha, his preceptor. Both persons are generally held to belong to the latter half of the 14th cent. A.D. at the latest. Anantā. therefore, cannot be placed earlier than the 14th cent. A.D.

9. Vide श्रीशङ्कराचार्य—जीवनचरित तथा उपदेश—p. 11.

10. Vide श्रीशङ्कराचार्य व त्यांचा सम्प्रदाय—p. 18.

11. Vide *Indian Antiquary*—Vol. V—p. 287.

12. The stanzas are :

अविचार्यं विचार्यं वा ब्रह्माध्यासनिरूपणात । असन्देहफलत्वाभ्यां न विचारं तदर्हति ॥
अध्यासोऽहं ब्रह्मशब्दः साङ्गब्रह्मश्रुतीरितम् । सन्देहान्मुक्तिभावाच्च विचार्यं ब्रह्म वै ततः ॥ on Br. Su. 1 : 1 : 1 :

and पारिप्लवार्थमाख्यानं किं वा विद्यास्तुतिस्तुतेः । ज्यायोऽनुष्ठानशेषत्वं तेन पारिप्लवार्थकः ॥ on Br. Su. 3 : 4 : 23

If this is correct, Anantā cannot be admitted to be Śaṅkara's direct disciple, even if we accept for the latter the latest date, viz. 8th cent. A.D. The expression अप्रतिहतशिष्य may, therefore, mean that Anantā came in the direct line of Śaṅkara and nothing more.

Now, according to the line of succession of the Kāñcī mutt (which the Śṛṅgerī people call into question), Śuddhānanda and Ānandagiri are the 6th and 7th ācāryas from the first ācārya. If this is true and if following the method adopted by modern scholars for computing time, we ascribe an average of 25/30 years to every ācārya, Ānandagiri cannot be placed much later than 200 years after Śaṅkara.

Even if we choose to distrust the Kāñcī succession list, we can prove Ānandagiri's priority to 1100 A.D. in another way. According to Veṅkaṭa Dixit and Jayatīrtha, the commentators of Rāmānujācārya and Madhvācārya, the latter criticise Śaṅkara's interpretation of the Bhg. at many places. Now, Ānandagiri has also commented upon Śaṅkara's GBh. If he had known the criticisms of Rāmā. and Madhva, he would certainly have tried to defend Śaṅkara against them but he does not do so anywhere. This is possible only on the hypothesis that he preceded both and, therefore, also preceded 12th cent. A.D. This automatically proves his priority to Anantā who, as already shown, cannot be placed earlier than the 14th cent. A.D.

The conclusion, therefore, seems irresistible that Ānandagiri is the earlier of the two writers and that Anantā must have drawn upon his Pr. Ś.V. while writing his own Ś.V.[13] In the absence of the former, it is not possible to say anything about its authenticity and the same granted also, it is not possible to say how far the Anantā has kept to the original or where and how much, if at all, he has deviated from the same. It is, therefore, unsafe to draw any inferences as to the authenticity of Anantā's work. For that, we must look to other sources and that brings me to the second of the two issues referred to at the beginning.

Authenticity of the work

Opinion is sharply divided on this point both among the traditionists and the modern scholars. The Kāñcī mutt people look upon this work as very authoritative and have taken great pains to answer objections

13. It is for this reason also that I cannot accept the contention of the Kāñcī people that the Pr. Ś. Jaya referred to by Mādhvācārya at 1 : 1 of his S. Ś. Jaya is the same as the S. V. of Ananta. Vide श्रीशङ्करपीठतत्वदर्शनम्—pp. 16 to 20. That otherwise also, this contention cannot be maintained is sufficiently clear from my previous article (JUB—Vol. XXIX—Part 2, Sept. 1960). The correspondences referred to by them (i.e. Kañcī people) only point to a common source for both.

raised against it.[14] The Śṛṅgerī Mutt and its adherents, however, negative the claim with equal vehemence, saying that it is more or less a fabrication for the express purpose of boosting up the claim of the Kāñcī Mutt,[15] which has also published an "embellished" (परिष्कृत) edition of the same and hence it is valueless for purposes of history. The reasons given for this view may be stated as follows :

(1) Both the original and the 'embellished' editions "even in its language and in its contents bear such evident traces of recent fabrication by unskilled hands that the reliance placed upon it is being relaxed for some time past ;"[16] and that "it is full of discrepancies and mistakes."[17]

(2) It contains references to Rāmānuja and Madhva.[18]

Among the moderns, Prof. Wilson alone holds that "the work is sufficiently historical since it bears internal and indisputable evidence of being the composition of a period not far removed from that at which he (i.e. Śaṅkara) may be supposed to have flourished..."[19] Mr. Telang however has controverted this view with regard to the work. Mr. Collins Mackenzie describes this work as "a legendary life of Sankara"[20] while the editor of the catalogue of Mss. in Saraswati Mahal Library, Tanjore, says that "A perusal of the work will convince anybody that the work is very unreliable. It is full of discrepancies and mistakes."[21]

(3) It contains particulars, subversive of all known versions, of Śaṅkara's parentage, birth place and the place of his final disappearance.[22] Thus, Śaṅkara's grand-parents are mentioned as Vidvan Mahendra (विद्वन्महेंद्र) and Kāmākṣī (कामाक्षी), parents as Sarvajit (सर्वजित्) and Viśiṣṭā (विशिष्टा), birth-place as Cidambaram and the place of final departure as Kāñcī. Further, he is stated to have met and received initiation into Sannyāsa from Govindamuni at Cidambaram only, from which place again, he started on his triumphant tour. His encounter with Vyāsa is very queerly narrated. Perhaps, these are the discrepancies and mistakes referred to in (1) above. We may also add that the work does very scant justice to Śaṅkara-Maṇḍana discussion and omits all reference to important events like the passing away of Śaṅkara's mother, acquisition of disciples like Sadānanda etc.

14. Vide श्रीशाङ्करपीठतत्वदर्शनम्—pp. 14 to 16.

15. Vide pamphlets "Sri Śṛṅgeri Śāradā Mutt" and "Kāmakoṭi Pradeepam" by Shri S. Sunderamiah and "Kumbakonam Mutt claims" by Shri R. Krishnaswamy Aiyar.

16. Vide 'Kumbakonam Mutt claims'—p. 12.

17. Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss., Saraswati Mahal, Tanjore, p. 3231.

18. Vide 'Kumbakonam Mutt claims—p. 12.

19. Shri Venkataraman quoted by Shri Sunderamiah in Śrī Śṛṅgerī Śāradā Mutt"—p. 26.

20. Quoted by K. T. Telang—vide I.A.—Vol. V—p. 287.

21. Vide Oxford Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss.—p. 818.

22. Vide Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss., Sarasvati Mahāl—p. 3231.

It must be admitted that in this maze of conflicting opinions, it is very difficult to come to a decisive verdict either way. I may, however, state my findings as follows:

I have yet to see the 'embellished' edition of the work. I was, however, told by a Śāstrin (Śri Pollaham Ramasastrin) at Mylapore, Madras, that no such edition had been published by the Kāñcī Mutt so far. He has written a small booklet on this particular Ś.V. in some mss. of which, available in Government Oriental Mss. Library, Madras, the additional paragraphs, pointed out by Sri R. K. Aiyar in 'Kumbakonam Mutt claims' as from the embellished edition, were to be found. The Śāstrin told me that this was being described as the 'embellished' edition of the Ś.V. He himself expressed the opinion that a critical edition of the work, putting together all the available mss. of this work in different places was a great necessity and in the circumstances this appears to be the maximum fair criticism of the additional passages.

Mr. Collins' remark, however, that the work is "a legendary life" need not be taken literally for it will be appreciated that to the average western mind, everything and every happening that does not conform to the every-day experience of the common man is a legend. This was particularly so at the beginning of Oriental Studies. After the recent advances in the different fields of science like telepathy and clairvoyance, extra-sensory perception and para-psychology etc.; it is no longer necessary to believe that no such thing as what can be called 'a miracle' can be a fact of life. Dr. Burnell gives no reasons for the statement re: the modernity of the work. Arguments from style and language are subjective and hence not conclusive.

(*ii*) Mr. Venkaṭaraman's statement regarding the reference to Rāmānuja and Madhva in Anantā's work cannot be understood. I was unable to find any such reference in the printed edition of the work and neither Mr. Venkataramana nor the two critics, Mr. S. Sunderamiah and Mr. R. K. Aiyar state where these references are to be found. It is, indeed, interesting to know that Prof. Wilson thought of placing the work prior to the 11th cent. A.D. just because it made no reference either to Rāmā. or Madhva.[23]

(*iii*) The main objection seems to be with regard to the particulars of Śaṅkara's parentage etc. I hope to show in a later article that from the evidence in hand, it seems more likely that the place of Śaṅkara's passing away is Kāñcī rather than Kailāsa. I shall, therefore, discuss the other aspects of this last objection.

23. Quoted by K. T. Telang—vide I.A.—Vol. V—p. 287.

The objection with regard to the particulars of Śaṅkara's parentage will, if true, have to be immediately conceded. I have, however, consulted a number of mss.[24] for this particular purpose and found that they fall into two groups, one giving Kālaṭi as the birth-place of Śaṅkara etc. and the other giving Cidambaram as the birth-place etc. Both these groups contain very old Tāḍa-patra mss., thus obviating the possibility of one of the two being a later thought or fabrication. In the present state of our knowledge, no completely satisfactory explanation can be given for this contradiction in the mss. The following two considerations may, however, be noted with profit.

(*i*) Acyutārāya Modak (1820 A.D.) in his commentary on Mādhava's S. Ś. Jaya says: "अनन्तानन्दगिर्युक्तशाङ्करविजये तु" कालटयाख्ये ग्रामवर्ये केरलाकङ्कती द्विजः । "इत्युक्तम् ॥"[25]

Comm. on S. S... Jaya—II: 1 This shows that the copy of Anant's. Ś. V. before A. Modak also must have contained the same particulars as in the other biographies of Śankara.

(*ii*) While introducing the story of Śaṅkara's life, G.V.K. (Guruvaṁśa-Kāvya), which describes the birth of Śaṅkara at Kālaṭi in Kerala Pradesha, states at I: 6 that the same story has already been described by 'great poets' (कवीन्द्रैः ।). The commentator who is also the author of the Kāvya, states very clearly that the great poets are Ānandagiri-yati and c. (आनन्दगिरियतीन्द्रादिभिः) ।. This Kāvya is undoubtedly a Śṛṅgeri mutt work and I leave it to scholars to draw their own conclusions in the matter.

With regard to the omissions, it has been found that almost no biography of Śaṅkara gives any reliable account of Śaṅkara-Maṇḍana controversy. These other works do not also necessarily recount all the incidents in Śaṅkara's life. It is again the other works, particularly that of Mādhava and those that follow him (works of Sadānanda and Nīlakaṇṭha) that are guilty of the most glaring anachronisms. No such anachronism is to be found in Anantā.'s work.

24. Mss. from (*i*) Ānandāśrama Mss. Library, Poona—2 mss.; (*ii*) Sarasvati Mahāl Library, Tanjore—1 ms.

25. The stanzas in question are:

कालटयाख्ये ग्रामवर्ये केरलालङ्कृती द्विजः । विद्याधिराजतनयः प्राज्ञः शिवगुरुर्बभौ ॥
ततः सदाशिवः सम्मुलोकानुग्रहतत्परः । तपोमहिम्ना तत्पत्न्यां प्रविवेश स्वतेजसा ॥
सा दधार सती गर्भमादित्यसमतेजसम् । व्यजायत शुभे काले पञ्चोच्चग्रहसंयुते ॥
आनन्दन् बान्धवाः सर्वे पुष्पवर्षं दिवश्च्युतैः । शम्भोर्वरमनुसृत्य पिता शिवगुरुः किल ॥

All this does not mean that I regard this Ś.V. as absolutely authoritative. My only point is that the arguments and objections put forward against it cannot prove either the forged nature or the unreliability of the work. Palm-leaf mss. of this work are to be found throughout India, from Kāśī to Kāñcī and Ujjain to Mysore. The charge, therefore, that the work in question is forged by the Kāñcī mutt to serve their ends is as much justified as is the charge that Mādhavācārya's S. Ś. Jaya was got up by the Śṛṅgerī mutt to support its claim in its case against the Kāñcī mutt. Its authenticity, however, does not follow as a logical sequel. As a matter of fact, not one of the 16/17 biographies of Śaṅkara I have worked upon inspires confidence in its authenticity to the expected degree. We have to put together all these biographies and after they are made mutually corroborative, we are able to get only an outline sketch of the great man's life.

ABBREVIATIONS

- (*i*) Anantā—Anantānandagiri
- (*ii*) Rāmā—Rāmānuja
- (*iii*) Ś.V.—Śaṅkara Vijaya
- (*iv*) Pr. Ś.V.—Prācīna Śaṅkara Vijaya
- (*v*) S. Ś. Jaya—Saṅkṣepa Śaṅkara Jaya
- (*vi*) Br. Sū.—Brahma Sūtras
- (*vii*) GBh.—Gītā Bhāṣya
- (*viii*) JUB—Journal of the University of Bombay
- (*ix*) I.A.—Indian Antiquary

SOME GLIMPSES OF THE SOCIETY AND CULTURE AS REFLECTED IN THE PAUMACARIYA

BY DR. P. M. UPADHYE, M.A., Ph.D.

THE Paumacariya of Vimalasūri is one of the earliest Prākrit epics of the Śvetāmbara sect of Jainas and it depicts the Life of Rāma according to Jain traditions. The work is quite extensive and it contains about 9000 gāthās in 118 chapters. Though the date of the P.C. is a disputable question, it is more or less certain that the work must have been composed after the Christian era.

The aim of this article is to present before the readers some glimpses of the society and culture as reflected in this earliest Prākrit epic, viz. the Paumacariya of Vimalasūri. The data given in this article should not be looked upon as anything more than a sampling of the vast material contained in the whole of the P.C., it can be the subject of thorough and systematic study on its merit. But this being not one of the direct objectives of this article, an attempt has been made to illustrate this aspect by taking out some samples of the relevant data from various portions of the text. Hence this study should be considered more or less representative and not exhaustive.

The information collected deals with the following aspects :

(A) *Social Life*

- (*a*) Society in general
- (*b*) Houses
- (*c*) Conveyance
- (*d*) Food and drink
- (*e*) Dress
- (*f*) Ornaments
- (*g*) Women
- (*h*) Education
- (*i*) Manners and Customs
- (*j*) Amusements and Pastimes
- (*k*) Morals

(B) ***Flora and Fauna***

(C) ***Religion***

(D) ***Political Life***

- (*a*) The King and kingship
- (*b*) Administration
- (*c*) Law and Justice
- (*d*) Army-Weapons